



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:
<http://hdl.handle.net/2328/27231>

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/1799
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

Title:

Address to the 12th Australian Planning Congress, Brisbane, 1972

Please acknowledge the source as:
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/1799

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

ADDRESS TO THE 12TH AUSTRALIAN PLANNING CONGRESS, BRISBANE,
1972, BY DON DUNSTAN, PREMIER OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA. 21.8.72

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, Distinguished Guests,
 Ladies and Gentlemen:

Some Australians have a vision of an ideal Australia which lies basking in the sun. It is a land whose people are diverse, humane and generous. It is a healthy country and one in which the arts and sciences flourish, where scholarship is respected, and where all men regard each other as brothers in all respects - socially, economically and politically. This Australia is not necessarily a wealthy country. Similarly, it is not necessarily a powerful one. But it is one with great influence on the peoples of its region, and by extension one with great influence on the world.

In such an Australia the people have learned all the lessons which can now be taught concerning their environment in the widest sense, and its relationship to other environments. They live in cities which reflect in layout, design, architecture and social function a multi-faceted and, at times, splendid culture. They are fed by, or disport in, rural hinterlands that exemplify ideals of agricultural and ecological stability. Overall shines a bright sun in a clear sky. The air is fresh. The rain, when it falls, is clean. Utopia has settled on it, like a hen on eggs.

Now I suspect that in various ways that vision is with us all. For the capitalists, such a society would allow endless opportunities for quietly rapacious speculation. For the scholar, in the nation's campuses there would be many, many mansions. For the Marxist-Leninist, every cook would indeed be a Prime Minister.

Town Planners would never be attacked. Premiers would have an endless series of absolute majorities and like Lee Kuan Yew no opposition, and flippancy aside, I believe that, in a sense, we are all working for an ideal state in human affairs, having defined that state for ourselves, using such criteria as have impressed us both as thinking people and as emotional types.

In my opinion city or environment planning, like any other form of social planning, automatically calls into question all the base assumptions we as a people make about our present way of life. Further, when we involve ourselves in planning cities we are dealing with civilization's most complex social manifestation. Even the process of observing it changes it. Every new building, road, path or activity disturbs it. Seen as a pond, the city's surface is ruffled not only by the boulders which are say, highrise office blocks, but also by the stones which are houses, the pebbles which are cars, and the dust which is people. And this is the reason why there can never be - for as long as human beings remain as they are - a precise science of city planning. It is much more an art. Science can only assist the implementation of the planner's scheme.

Now in saying that I do not intend to sound high-flown. The fact is, cities, countries, civilizations are made by people, individually and in groups, selected randomly, responding randomly, sometimes with articulated ideals. The potter does not make the clay, he shapes it. Each of us have, no matter how objective we wish to be, an influence, and occasionally a decided influence, on our society. And with cities, for instance, there are always people who will lean more towards one set of social or planning options than another. They will

do this within a determining social context - but nevertheless the decision will be a group (or at times an individual) one. Sometimes it is a creative and civilizing one.

But no matter what set of options are chosen, there are no easy solutions to urban planning. There never have been. Even dictatorships, who need not too closely concern themselves with public opinion or pressure groups, have found the implementation of planning schemes fraught with difficulties, and that supposed solutions often compound problems or create new ones. In a society such as ours, planners, and Governments interested in planning a better human environment, not only have to deal with the abstract functional aspects of the plan, but also the multifarious and vocal interest groups affected by it. And, as we all know, these can range from the massive commercial interests of large land holders and builders, through to the individual concern of an old age pensioner who has lovingly cultivated for forty years a small garden of intricately arranged cacti and which he understandably would be broken hearted to leave.

Now, by and large, my sympathies are for the latter kind of interest group. I feel little sympathy for those groups which find themselves in conflict with planning concepts of proven worth. Such groups are concerned with simply continuing what they have found are profitable land use patterns. Further I have no sympathy for the kind of commercial interest which subjects the mass of people in a city to jammed up communication patterns or debased urban aesthetics.

It is one of the continually said things about our society that in planning, the voice of the pensioner - for whom read citizen - is drowned by the shout of the shareholder, or flattened by the minute of the public Authority. That is what I feel. The solution, economically, is of course more complex.

Now in South Australia we have for some time been involved in all the varied problems which occur when a Government endeavours to do something effective about the problems of the Australian urban and suburban environments.

Adelaide, as some of you would know, is potentially a most attractive city. The central city area was designed, very pleasantly, by an early 19th century city planner, Colonel William Light. The suburbs which grew surrounding the central area were in their layout determined by and large by the Torrens Title system of land division. For the first hundred years of the city's life it developed, with these determinants, in the way most Australian cities developed - placidly and pleasantly. And during a good half of this time, for a variety of reasons of which I am sure you are all aware, its citizens grew to accept the notion that there was only one desirable way of life, and that was in a house fronted by a lawn, backed by a clothesline, and settled amongst roses and fruit trees. Now I do not 'knock' that form of suburban development, though a lot could be done to make it better in its own terms. I simply believe that there should be a much greater variety of living styles available to people and while the now ubiquitous suburban villa was built upon the desire of many people for such a living style, the land and building interests that service this desire create its further demand, determine the shape of our cities, and determine the very nature of most of our building and land transactions.

The effect of this is now well known. Adelaide is now a kind of highrise pimple surrounded by an ever extending contusion of villas, from among which occasionally uprears a lonely office block or highrise apartment house. This shape, extending north to south some forty miles and, at its widest, east to west some twenty miles, is serviced by an expensive though badly patronised public transport system, and the individual motor car. It suffers from the lack of visual taste that affects the look of all Australian cities, while in the central city areas, it is beginning to suffer from urban blight. Through the speculative inflation of inner city land values and the demands of the motor car, the area is becoming a waste of vacant treeless allotments used by day for parking and at night by alley cats, surrounded by highrise office towers, cheap warehouses, small factories, and the remnants of a now depressed, and quickly vanishing, residential population.

That is how we are now. And in relation to it, I would like to make a number of observations. They relate specifically to the suburban villa as it is found from Broome to Bordertown, or Perth to Penrith, and even, which always amazes me, on lonely tracts of bush where it has often replaced, complete with plaster gnomes, the old stone verandahed farmhouse that had functionally protected a farming family from heat and cold for a hundred years.

However, I don't want to talk about its architecture. The late Robin Boyd has done that very effectively. I wish to talk about the pressures that the suburban villa places upon a city-State's economy and the lives of its citizens, and about other pressures which have recently emerged, and which are designed not only to let people buy villas, but also to insist that they do.

I am sure that, since I am before a group of planners, I am talking to the converted if I assert that the suburban villa and the motor car, determining as they do together the nature of contemporary suburban development, constitute the greatest planning problems we have to deal with.

Even so, I believe it's a good idea to say so, again and again, if only to raise a lonely voice against the shout that echoes throughout this country urging all people to enter as early as possible in their lives into a house debt that is, in relation to most salaries, of monstrous proportions. I would like to raise my voice against this as the dominant form of housing, since the debt guarantees most only a triple-fronted red brick veneer house of forty years of less effective life, on a block of land of grossly inflated value, twenty minutes from an inadequate bus service, three-quarters of an hour from the city or factory, on a muddy road for often ten years of the forty, often unsewered for some years in some cities, and forever in others.

Further, people driven or persuaded to make this choice, find themselves then not only with the millstone of their mortgage, but also with the social disruption or pressure of lawn and garden house maintenance, commuting car and shopping car payments, not to mention the cost of the lawn mower, clothes line, etcetera. Life thus revolves, restrictively around the telly and the job, and is concerned with little more than paying for what is constantly consumed or needs to be constantly maintained.

Now what I have just done is paint by implication some of the more disadvantageous aspects of the suburban ideal. I have not mentioned, deliberately, the advantages - advantages that can be seen in most middle and upper middle class suburbs that are within five miles or so of any Australian G.P.O.

There, the trees are green, the parks are plentiful, the roads tree-lined, the houses stable, the services secure, and the shopping centre and public transport service established. It is a highly desirable way of life. It is a criterion against which all forms of suburban development are judged. It is, however, and even so, not the only good way to live, or to bring up children. Our housing development in Australia has centred on this particular ideal, and given the budgetary arrangements of our public Authorities and the economics of speculative building. It is not entirely surprising that this should be so because this is cheapest for them. The average Housing Commission or Trust, building society or speculative builder does not in any real way have to take into account in budgeting what is the general cost to the community of urban sprawl. Not only do they not appear to think about the social difficulties created, but within the terms of their budget they do not have to provide for general services, certainly not for the extra cost of extending water, sewerage, transport and of building freeways. The cheapest way therefore (if we look at the budget of a public or private developer in isolation) of providing housing for family units is to go out, buy land in an area where land is still cheap, subdivide and put up cottages. This is so even with public housing Authorities. Examine the budget of these together with the Commonwealth-State housing agreement and the way in which State budgets are structured and it will be seen that overall social and community costs are not charged to the Authority. Each Department's lines are concerned with the responsibilities of that Department. Moneys are advanced to building societies without relating their progress to overall community costs. Too often budgetary as well as in administrative terms decisions are made as if Government Departments were separate compartments.

The rising costs to the community of urban sprawl have not been sufficiently emphasised. To allow inner suburban areas to decay and to spread the population of a city further and further from the centre means that public transport costs are inevitably increased and must be subsidized. People in the outer suburbs cannot afford economic fares for travelling long distances to work. At the same time the number of short-haul fares in the inner areas decline. Public transport deficits can be expected constantly to climb with continued sprawl of the suburbs. In the meantime inner city areas decay and are denuded of population, although provided with services upon whose capital cost the community is still paying interest. The provision of water and sewerage to spreading suburbia is increasingly costly and difficult. With summer water shortages felt now in most capital cities, how long, given projected city growth, can we continue to pour water out for cottage gardens for every family? The cost of freeways, inevitable in the Australian metropolis if it continues to spread, is stupendous. And inevitably the pollution rate and time waste of individual motor car transport increases to heights of discomfort. So that is the argument against suburbia. What is the alternative?

Many planners would argue that one way to stop the disfunctional aspects of suburban development is to provide a variety of housing types, ranging from terrace housing to walk-up flats and to highrise apartments, in areas of urban decay. Further, they have argued that for cultural and social reasons this would have advantages which would offset the communal disadvantages of spreading a city's population as widely and thinly as possible, thus forcing people into isolated boxes from which they commute in gasoline-propelled capsules.

I think there is a great deal of sense in this argument. In Australia our inner and older city areas are in many cases both ideal for residential use (because of their proximity to work and leisure areas) and subject to progressively rapid decay. In cities like Adelaide the visible decay is in places further advanced than comparable areas in, say, Richmond or Redfern, because densities in Adelaide have never been very great and our single level 19th century cottage is much less structurally substantial than, say, Redfern's or Paddington's terraces.

Nevertheless, all Australian cities now have what appears to be a significant amount of land available for inner-city residential living.

But the problem is that the cost of such redevelopment land is normally so high that it is impossible to create residential units at an economic rental capable of being met by medium and low income groups. Further, it is one of the unfortunate facts of federalism as we experience it at the moment, that while the States know what their problems in relation to urban planning are, or if they don't they should - they do not have the financial power to do anything of the order necessary to, on the one hand, stop the sprawl, and, on the other, redevelop areas of urban deterioration.

Nor do I mean by inner-city redevelopment the wholesale tearing down of buildings and existent communities simply to replace them with an asphalt desert and highrise blocks of flats. I mean, rather, a far more judicious development which while aiming at increasing population densities in those areas, does so on the basis that the existing community - if there is one - is not displaced but augmented; not bulldozed, but added to; not compartmentalized, but given the possibility and opportunity of achieving again the social and economic cohesiveness that should exist in an urban city region.

Further, such redevelopment should mean progressive planning, involving on the one hand the community of the area and on the other and where possible the new settlers. It should not be a scheme that sets out simply to house a given number of people who cannot afford the suburban ideal. Rather it should create a new urban ideal. It should re-introduce small families to the terrace house, providing it is properly planned, built and soundproofed; it should give people the opportunity to enjoy both the solitude of gardens, parks and squares and the gossip of a community shopping centre, meeting place, creche, pub and restaurant. It should do this not by postulating that all development should be composed of any one form of housing - high, medium or low rise - but rather by shaping the housing forms to the needs of the community in the round. In such a way you would have in any given scheme the capacity for all forms of housing - aesthetics and social effectiveness would then be the criteria used to plan them.

But even with this kind of scheme, the planner will find he is under attack. For as I said much earlier, to plan a city, or a city region, is to become involved with the mechanics of society's most complex social manifestation.

Further, because modern forms of administrative organisation are involved, any change or development of a residential nature that is not of a kind that people readily understand often creates first suspicion, then anger, and finally, if the planners have not been sensitive, communicative, and responsive, a kind of paranoia directed at big brother Government and his planning henchmen.

Once that point is reached, no matter how sympathetic an Authority may be, or how deeply involved even to an intimate decision making capacity the community may be, suspicions remain in the hearts of those who thrive on suspicion. The arguments become too emotionally charged ever to be effectively answered, because the arguer finds himself arguing for his, private, ultimate vision of social or community organisation. Hence the current fashionable disgust felt about the idea of people living any higher than about fifty feet from the street. In this, it is not the right of the individual not to live above that height that is involved, but rather, whether anyone should be allowed to live at that height at all. The argument, of course, misses the point. I don't think Governments in Australia should force low income families into twenty storey three bedroom flats with a balcony.

I do not know of any case in which such developments have worked, other than in Singapore and Hong Kong, where necessity itself (together with the Chinese family structure) has made a virtue of the beehive. But who knows? Perhaps it can be done. European cities have been able to develop and culturally prosper at an average of six floors of living.

Still, given the kinds of cities we have in Australia, and the kind of people we have, it is only the affluent family, the single person, and the young married who chooses by and large to live twenty stories up. And this is especially so in Sydney where in some inner city high density areas there is established an urban way of life which is very similar to that found in Europe.

For the rest, the wealthy retired couple and the affluent swinger may wish for an apartment, connoting as the name does a filmic vision of Fifth Avenue, but for the average Australian of any set of social interests, something closer to the ground is a better idea. So we see the rising popularity of both old and new styles of terrace houses, or the fairly bland acceptance of the three storey walk-up flat, or the delight people often take in small group cottage estates. The housing density is significantly higher in such cases, and yet the social apprehension that the words "high rise" arouse is not there. Even so, the Government that moves to provide such forms of housing, or the planner who includes them in his scheme of things, does so in peril of investing itself, or himself, with a 'big brother' cast by those sometimes very articulate supporters of the endless suburbs.

A third problem which confronts planners in this area is that which I have already touched on, namely the problem of effectively dealing with people who remain in areas of gross suburban deterioration. As I have suggested, the general approach to redevelopment should be gradual and evolutionary. In other words,

The grand redevelopment scheme should, except where unoccupied land is available, give way to a gradualist rehabilitative approach. This is not to say that the planner should not have a clearly defined idea of how a redevelopment scheme in an area of urban deterioration should ultimately look assuming that he has involved his community, he is providing for it properly, and his criteria are of humanity rather than merely of architecture. But rather it is to say that given his base concept, determined as it should be by the complex needs of people in the area, he should be prepared to remain open minded and sufficiently flexible to adjust to the constantly changing nature of his task.

New facts, even the arrival of new residents to a redevelopment should allow him to find out progressively if all his earliest assumptions were correct.

Nevertheless, there are obviously cases in which the deterioration of an area has reached such critical proportions that it is affecting not only those citizens in the area, but also adjacent, more stable areas. And when this occurs - when actual slum conditions occur - Governments in particular have only two options open to them. They can either allow the area to rot, or they can seek to redevelop it. And in such cases, more often than not, the very deterioration has had a compounding effect that has sent all but the aged and under-privileged out of the area. The problem, then, is what to do with the remaining population, assuming that in the general area a point of no return has been reached. This is perhaps the most difficult problem a planner or a Government has to face. Strong ties to the area have been made by some. People react very strongly to forced change.

Now I think I must admit that I don't know the ultimate answer to a situation in which, say, twenty citizens in an area of twenty acres are violently opposed to any form of change to their environment, even though the area in the large is a waste land and the scheme would be significantly and adversely affected if their properties remained. Ideally they should be allowed to remain. If for any of a number of reasons it is desirable in the long term interests of the project they must go, the Authority should involve itself in something far more human than a land valuation payment. Significant compensation must be given. Rehousing should be provided by the Authority with the citizen's consent and agreement. Special officers should be appointed to work at a personal level, not only in finding the citizen's choice of a relocation site, but also at times such as moving day. Relocation should even include the garden, if possible. In other words, Governments and planners have to remove themselves from desks and drawing boards, and become involved with the people they are planning for.

Now all that I have said is particularly pertinent to my Government because it has a redevelopment scheme in which many of the matters I have touched on are issues right now and which has become a classic case in confrontation and misunderstanding. The North Hackney area is an inner city area about a mile and a half from the central business district. It has always been a low income area housing some 180 to 250 residents in 13 acres. It is a run down area, made up mainly of decrepit 19th century cottages, a C.S.I.R.O. research unit with sheep pens, a caravan park, a church, a pub, and a small car park.

Some of the residents were pensioners renting premises, others were older couples, and there were at one time a number of migrant families. In addition, a road runs through the area which carries a large amount of through traffic and creates hazardous conditions for children, and there was no public transport and little remaining social activity or cohesion.

Now in 1965 it was decided that here was an area that would respond to redevelopment of a kind that was economically feasible for a State Government.

A Committee was appointed, plans were drawn up, but before the scheme could get off the ground, there was the 1968 election in which my Government - not because of the scheme - was voted out. Nothing then happened for two years, except that the area deteriorated a little more and the South Australian Housing Trust and the local Council acquired some of the houses of the area that had been declared sub-standard.

Then in 1969, when my present Government was elected we commenced work on the scheme again. We reduced the total area from 27 acres to the 13 acres on which action was desperately needed. New terms of reference were given to the State Planning Authority's redevelopment committee to ensure that in the proposals made for the area the problems of local residents would be dealt with and that the scheme would provide for workers, young people and aged, and to ensure that the hundred or so people then living in the area could be rehoused at Government expense, adequately and conveniently, and to their specifications. This could be done either outside the area, or they could have first choice of new accommodation in the redevelopment. Financially, all the residents of the area would be better off. Socially, those residents who elected to stay in the scheme would have the benefits of a traffic free and landscaped environment and the company of about a thousand lower and middle income residents, in a fifty/fifty mix. But perhaps the worst thing that happened socially in this matter was the two year period when the project was put on ice. This meant that residents did not know what was to happen to their properties. The result was that when we came back into office we had to allay fears that some kind of anonymous Governmental machine was about to overtake the area. In addition, there was an eighteen month or so period during which the plans necessary for the scheme to proceed were revised and revised before publication so the Government officers involved found it necessary to involve themselves very closely in the fears, hopes, aspirations and tastes of the residents.

Simultaneously, there was a dialogue in an adjacent area over uncontrolled two storey spec-built flats which caused some residents of the area to form a St. Peter's Ratepayers Association to press their point of view to the local Council. And because that Council was also responsible for the area of Hackney, the Association decided to take up cudgels on behalf of what they believed were the hardpressed residents of the area.

And so there resulted a classic redevelopment battle with the Ratepayers Association on the one hand believing that a quite baroque series of planning and social sins were being perpetrated by the Government and Council, and on the other, with the Government and its officers endeavouring to make the issue candid and open, while being accused of deception and intrigue, with the sixty or so remaining residents of the area wishing to blazes everyone would leave them alone but in decent housing.

The tale of accusation, answer, counter accusation, blast and counter-blast would be comical if it had not the serious consequence of damaging the respect of citizens for this general process of doing something effective about a very real urban problem.

The local residents, sick of a long period of uncertainty, demanded before publication of the plan to know whether it was intended to proceed, and if it was, what was to be the compensation procedure for properties in the area, and that a liaison officer with local residents should be appointed. The Government announced that it was intended to proceed, no compulsory acquisition would take place in the foreseeable future. The Housing Trust would be a willing buyer for any willing seller, that compensation would be full replacement and relocation costs, and appointed a liaison officer.

Through his discussions with local residents he arranged purchase of most houses in the area and the relocation of their owners in better circumstances. The St. Peters Resident's Association however, charged that this process in itself brought unfair pressure on residents.

They further charged that a proposal to replace sub-standard housing was socially improper because low income families in need of welfare assistance could only afford the rents of sub-standard houses. When it was pointed out the welfare assisted families in the area were recent arrivals and were only temporarily in the Housing Trust owned houses because of the desperate shortage of emergency housing in Adelaide and were simply awaiting vacancies in low rental Housing Trust houses elsewhere, the Association's publicists charged that we had introduced these families to this area to help depress the prices of remaining houses and to pressure the residents.

Residents protested that some empty houses were becoming infested by rats and vagrants and that this was obnoxious to residents and depressing the value of other houses. When these houses were demolished the Association's publicists charged the Government with making the scheme a fait-accompli before a supplementary development plan had been accepted. And so it went on and on.

And that is where the matter lies now. The redevelopment plan for the area has been publicly available at the Council office. Under Section 38 of our Planning and Development Act it remained there for two months during which time objections to the plan were lodged. Such objections were then considered by the Council, summarised and sent with draft regulations to the Minister, who has now referred them to the State Planning Authority for a report and recommendation.

The lessons which can be learnt from our Adelaide experience are, I believe, of fundamental importance to any Government redeveloping a run-down residential area. And they relate chiefly to communication. It is essential to maintain at every point in the planning process a close involvement with and by the residents for whom a scheme is designed. Their participation and agreement must be secured at each decisive point. If this is not done, the result can be more socially disturbing than the very situation that redevelopment should be endeavouring to alleviate. The Hackney story, of course, does not end there.

It is a project and a controversy which is still with us. All because some parties have not yet been informed, I cannot at this stage say in which way we intend to restructure some of the organisations involved in implementing the scheme: nevertheless it is to be done with the object being to incorporate planning procedures and approaches such as I have outlined today.

Now I have in fact today dealt generally with three of four problem areas in Australian urban planning. But there is one further area which I would briefly like to touch on. This concerns the role and effectiveness of Governmental planning authorities, and the present situation in South Australia. Any of you who are conversant with planning legislation in Australia, I am sure will agree that the legislative framework contained in the S.A. Planning and Development Act is the quintessence of flexibility and muscle. In other words, the State Planning Authority and officers who work with it have been provided with an immense legal basis on which to plan well in South Australia.

And a lot of work - good work - has now been done. But nevertheless, we have found that despite the powers and prerogatives allowed Government planners in South Australia, administratively we seem to be bogged down.

The State Planning Authority is empowered to recommend planning areas; prepare development plans; prepare, recommend and administer planning regulations; report on Local Government planning regulations; give interim development control of Local Government areas in the metropolitan area while planning regulations are being prepared; acquire, develop, sell and lease land; redevelop land; administer a planning and development fund; and set up such advisory committees or publish such reports and bulletins as it thinks fit.

Now I think you will agree that this is a fair list of tasks. There is a growing administrative staff to assist. But we still find in Adelaide, or in the State, that notwithstanding our planning structures there are areas in which the Authority has not been able to act using the planning controls it has. In addition, it was envisaged that the Authority would co-ordinate the work of those Government Departments that have a marked effect on the environment - namely Water and Sewerage, Roads and Transport, Local Government and Housing. And yet we find that there is very little co-ordination of these areas, while the powers of the Authority in relation to Local Government are seldom, if ever, effectively exercised. Hence, while, after a great battle, Parliament gave approval for State Planning controls of considerable potential benefit to all, we find that many of the areas the legislation and its administration was designed to look after are not under control at all.

Now why is this so? In my opinion - and I would like it understood that I am not here criticising individuals or officers - it is so because of something I mentioned very much earlier in this address. That is, the nature of planning itself requires that planners, like all of us, make specific value judgements concerning events in our society, and what might seem to some as desirable or at least benign developments, might to others be seen as quite disastrous. Further, with our State Planning Authority we find that representatives of Departments avoid attendance because they don't want valuable time to be lost in detailed planning decisions about particular matters not related specifically to the work of their Departments. .

But ultimately, it is a matter of vision. The Government Department which for the last twenty years has organised itself to service a constantly spreading suburbia often finds it hard to argue for planning procedures which imply consolidation rather than expansion. The Local Government organisation which has always jealously guarded its boundaries would find it hard to agree that in some respects its local sovereignty should be limited. The mere placing of Heads of Departments on an Authority designed to affect, delimit and co-ordinate Departmental decisions does not mean that effective delimiting and co-ordination occurs. It is plain we must restructure planning both administratively and at the local involvement level. At the same time many people expect planning to occur and quickly. It is no longer an area of responsibility to be shouldered by an adventurous Government.

Rather it is seen by an ever increasing number of people as the only way our country will remain unspoiled by unplanned speculation and our cities made comfortable again - again properly related in shape, style and structure to the actual and necessary requirements of the people who inhabit them. And that is a task to which my Government and, I believe, your Institute, is dedicated.
